

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 GEORGE JOHNSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 DONALD P. WANG,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C16-1738JLR

ORDER STRIKING AMENDED
ANSWER

15 On August 20, 2017, *pro se* Defendant Donald P. Wang filed an amended answer
16 in which he asserts a counterclaim for fraud against Plaintiff George Johnson. (Am.
17 Answer (Dkt. # 29).) However, at the time Mr. Wang filed the amended answer, the
18 period for amendment as a matter of course had passed, Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1), and Mr.
19 Wang did not have “the opposing party’s written consent or the court’s leave” to file the
20 amended answer, Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2); (*see* Dkt.). For these reasons, the court
21 STRIKES the amended answer (Dkt. # 29) as improperly filed. If Mr. Wang wishes to

22 //

1 amend his answer, he must do so in the manner set forth in Federal Rule of Civil
2 Procedure 15(a)(2). *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2).

3 Dated this 22nd day of August, 2017.

4
5 

6 JAMES L. ROBART
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22